

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted with a Request for Continued examination and in response to the Official Letters, dated July 20, 2004, and September 13, 2004. Claims 11, 13, 14, 15 and 17 have been amended. Claims 1 through 10, 18 and 19 have been cancelled. New claims 22 through 24 have been added. The application now includes claims 11 through 17 and 20 through 24, with claim 14 being the sole independent claim. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Letter dated September 13, 2004, the Examiner denied entry of an Amendment filed by the applicant on August 23, 2004, as not being fully responsive to the previous Official Letter dated July 20, 2004. The Examiner stated that the August 23<sup>rd</sup> Amendment raised new issues in an application whose prosecution had been closed. The Examiner also explained that, if the applicant desired to continue prosecution of the application, he should consider filing a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, applicant has filed a Request for Continued Examination concurrently with this Preliminary Amendment. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his suggestion and for allowing a one month response period.

In the Official Letter dated July 20, 2004, the Examiner stated that claims 7, 9 through 13 and 20 are directed toward an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed. The Examiner also stated that claim 14 is generic, but that claims 7, 9 through 13 and 20 do not include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Accordingly, the Examiner constructively elected claims 14 through 17 and 21 and withdrew claims 7, 9 through 13 and 20 from consideration as being directed toward a non-elected invention. The Examiner further stated that claims 14 through 17 and 21 are allowable over the prior art, but objected to claims 14 and 17 as lacking an antecedent basis for certain recited terms.

Applicant has amended generic independent claim 14 to recite an inertial sensor element, which, as stated in paragraph [0009] of the specification, may be either an angular rate sensor or an accelerometer. Because amended claim 14 continues to

recite the previously recited limitations, applicant believes that amended claim 14 remains allowable. Furthermore, applicant believes that amended claim 14 also remains a generic claim. Additionally, claims 11, 13 through 15 and 17 have been amended to include correct antecedent basis references.

New claims 22 recites that the inertial sensor element is an angular rate sensor while new claim 23 recites that the inertial sensor element is a linear acceleration sensor. Thus, new claims 22 and 23 introduce no new matter. Applicant also has amended claims 10 through 13 and 20 to depend from new claim 23. Similarly, applicant has amended claims 15 through 17 and 20 to depend from new claim 22. Because claim 14 is a generic claim and is allowable, applicant believes that claims 10 through 13, 15 through 17 and 20 through 23 also are allowable. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claims 10 through 13 and 20.

New dependent claim 24 recites the limitation of claim 17 and thus does not introduce any new matter. Because the Examiner previously stated that claim 17 included allowable subject matter, applicant respectfully requests that claim 24 be allowed.

In view of the amendments and above remarks, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance.